REMARKS

I. Status of Claims

Claims 1 and 3 are pending in this application, with claim 1 being independent. Claims 1 and 3 are currently amended. Without waiving any argument, and to advance prosecution, claims 2 and 4 are canceled without prejudice to and/or disclaimer of the subject matter therein.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Davis et al. (USP 4,788,889) ("Davis").

The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of these rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. Pending Claims

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Davis.

The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Davis at least because it recites, *inter alia*, "...a chuck portion is formed on the inner peripheral surface between the first internal gear and the second internal gear, and an inner diameter of the chuck portion ***is smaller than the diameter of the tip of the first internal gear and larger than the diameter of the bottom of the second internal gear***." (emphasis added)

Certain embodiments of the present invention relate to a composite gear and method of manufacturing the same, wherein an external gear 12 and a rotation support surface 32 or 34 are formed on the outer peripheral surface thereof and a first internal gear 16 and a second internal gear 18 are formed on the inner peripheral surface thereof at a predetermined interval in the rotating axis direction. Also, a chuck portion 20[1] is formed on the inner peripheral surface between the first internal gear and the second internal gear, and ***the inner diameter of the chuck portion is smaller than the diameter of the tip of the first internal gear and larger than the diameter of the bottom of the second internal gear***. See paragraph [0008] of the application as published.

---

[1] Chuck - an attachment for holding a workpiece or tool in a machine (as a drill or lathe). *See* Merriam-Webster on-line dictionary.

This configuration allows machining of the external gear and the rotation support surface with the inside being chucked at the chuck portion formed on the inner peripheral surface. Accordingly, the datum for locating a workpiece during machining of the external gear and that used during machining of the rotation support surface do not differ, and therefore the precision of the external gear can be improved.

In order to reject claim 1, the Office Action appears to rely upon FIG. 5A of Davis. More specifically, the Office Action purports to equate clutch teeth 340, 366 of Davis to the Applicant's first and second internal gears, and the inner diameter of the portion (the inner peripheral surface portion) located under the reference numeral "150" between clutch teeth 340, 366 to the Applicant's chuck portion. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that, even if the portion (inner peripheral surface portion) located under the reference numeral "150" in FIG. 5A of Davis is regarded as the chuck portion of certain embodiments of the present invention, the gear recited in the invention of claim 1, in which the inner diameter of the chuck portion is smaller that the diameter of the tip of the first internal gear and larger than the diameter of the bottom of the second internal gear, is not disclosed in Davis. Accordingly, even if the Office Action's correlation of elements in Davis to the invention of claim 1 was correct, which it is respectfully submitted that it is not, Davis still would not anticipate each and every limitation of the invention of claim 1.

Accordingly, lacking any teaching and/or suggestion of each and every limitation of the Applicant's claims, Davis does not anticipate the invention of claim 1 as alleged. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Further, the other cited references do not address the deficiencies of Davis. As discussed in *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, et al.,* No. 04-1350, (U.S. Apr. 30, 2007), the Applicant respectfully submits that it remains necessary to identify the reason why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been prompted to combine alleged prior art elements in the manner as claimed by the Applicant. Obviousness cannot be sustained on mere conclusory statements.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that, claim 1, as well as claim 3, are patentable over Davis and the other cited references.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition. Favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance are therefore respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4420 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2009

/Daniel G. Shanley/
Daniel G. Shanley
(Reg. No. 54,863)

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005-1257
Tel: (202) 220-4200
Fax: (202) 220-4201